

SHOOK, HARDY & BACON LLP

B. Trent Webb, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)

Eric Buresh, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)

2555 Grand Boulevard

Kansas City, Missouri 64108-2613

Telephone: (816) 474-6550

Facsimile: (816) 421-5547

bwebb@shb.com

eburesh@shb.com

Robert H. Reckers, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)

600 Travis Street, Suite 1600

Houston, Texas 77002

Telephone: (713) 227-8008

Facsimile: (731) 227-9508

rreckers@shb.com

LEWIS AND ROCA LLP

W. West Allen (Nevada Bar No. 5566)

3993 Howard Hughes Parkway, Suite 600

Las Vegas, Nevada 89169

Tel: (702) 949-8200

Fax: (702) 949-8398

WAllen@LRLaw.com

GREENBERG TRAURIG

Mark G. Tratos, Esq. (Nevada Bar No. 1086)

Brandon Roos, Esq. (Nevada Bar No. 7888)

Leslie Godfrey, Esq. (Nevada Bar No. 10229)

3773 Howard Hughes Parkway

Suite 400 North

Las Vegas, NV 89169

Telephone: (702) 792-3773

Facsimile: (702) 792-9002

tratosm@gtlaw.com

roosb@gtlaw.com

godfrey1@gtlaw.com

Attorneys for Defendants

RIMINI STREET, INC. and SETH RAVIN

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

ORACLE USA, INC., a Colorado corporation;
ORACLE AMERICA, INC., a Delaware
corporation; and ORACLE INTERNATIONAL
CORPORATION, a California corporation,

Plaintiffs,

v.

RIMINI STREET, INC., a Nevada corporation;
SETH RAVIN, an individual,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:10-cv-0106-LRH-PAL

**DEFENDANTS' RIMINI STREET, INC.
AND SETH RAVIN'S MOTION TO
PERMIT DEFENDANTS TO FILE
UNDER SEAL EXHIBITS 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7
and 8 TO THE DECLARATION OF
ROBERT H. RECKERS IN SUPPORT
OF THE PARTIES' JOINT CASE
MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE
STATEMENT**

I. INTRODUCTION

Defendants Rimini Street, Inc., and Seth Ravin (collectively, “Defendants”) respectfully request that the Court order the Clerk of the Court to file the following documents under seal:

- Exhibit 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7 and 8 attached to the Declaration of Robert H. Reckers in Support of the Parties’ Joint Case Management Conference Statement.

The un-redacted Exhibits 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7 and 8 were individually lodged with the Court on January 6, 2012. This request is made pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 5.2 and 26(c) and the Stipulated Protective Order entered by the Court on May 21, 2010 [Docket No. 55] (“Protective Order”).

II. ARGUMENT

Parties requesting to file documents under seal may overcome the presumption of public access by showing of good cause under Rule 26(c). “The law . . . gives district courts broad latitude to grant protective orders to prevent disclosure of materials for many types of information, including, but not limited to, trade secrets or other confidential research, development, or commercial information. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(c)(7).” *Phillips ex rel. Estates of Byrd v. Gen. Motors Corp.*, 307 F.3d 1206, 1211 (9th Cir. 2002).

Good cause exists for filing the above listed documents under seal. They have been designated as Confidential or Highly Confidential or they contain content that has been designated as Confidential or Highly Confidential under the terms of the Protective Order. By openly filing the remaining exhibits and documents that do not require confidentiality without seal, Defendants’ request is narrowly tailored. Because the above listed documents contain information designated as either “Confidential” or “Highly Confidential—Attorney Eyes Only,” good cause exists to permit a sealing order. *See, e.g., Pacific Gas and Elec. Co. v. Lynch*, 216 F. Supp. 2d 1016, 1027 (N.D. Cal. 2002).

III. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Defendants respectfully requests that the Court find that good cause exists to file under seal Exhibits 1, 2, 3, 5, 7 and 8 to the Declaration of Robert H. Reckers in

1 Support of the Parties' Joint Case Management Conference Statement. A Proposed Order is
2 submitted with this Motion.

3
4 DATED: January 6, 2012 SHOOK, HARDY & BACON

5
6 By: /s/ Robert H. Reckers
7 Robert H. Reckers, Esq.
8 Attorney for Defendants
9 Rimini Street, Inc. and Seth Ravin
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28